

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated August 27, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Brenner (U.S. Patent Application Publication no. 2004/0139842). The Examiner objected to claims 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 19, and 20 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. The Examiner further objected to the claims due to a number of informalities and objected to FIG. 1 for failing to depict the light sensor claimed in the claims, which light sensor is further referred to in the specification as light sensor 122. The rejections and objections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

In order to comply with the informalities objected to by the Examiner and further with the Examiner's objection to FIG. 1, all claims informally objected to by the Examiner have been amended or cancelled except for claim 9. The applicants believe that the reference to 'the remaining time value' in claim 9, line 6, should be 'the,' not 'a,' as 'a remaining time value' is earlier referenced in the claim. Also, the applicants have amended FIG. 1 by adding a light sensor 122 to the figure and have attached a Replacement Sheet of FIG. 1 to this amendment reflecting this change. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his objections to FIG. 1 and to the claims on the bases of informalities.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8, 10-12, 15, 17, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Brenner. The applicants have amended claim 1 to provide features of determining at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed and maintaining the illumination of the display screen for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter. The applicants believe that these features are not taught by Brenner

Brenner teaches synchronizing lighting groups of a mobile station with musical notes, that is, illuminating the lighting groups for a period of time corresponding to a duration of a musical note that is audibly played by the mobile station. The audible playing of a musical note is different from a visual display of message on a display screen, for example, an icon or number of textual characters or a number of lines of text displayed on a display screen. Nowhere does Brenner teach, nor does the Examiner contend that Brenner teaches, illuminating lighting groups based on a message displayed on a display screen, wherein the illumination period is based on at least one illumination time parameter that is, in turn, based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed.

Furthermore, Brenner cannot be considered to teach illuminating the display screen for a period of time associated with a message displayed on the display screen as there is no mention in Brenner as to how to determine an appropriate illumination period for a message, which does not have an inherent time duration similar to the audible duration of a musical note. Therefore, Brenner does not teach the features of claim 1 of determining at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed and maintaining the illumination of the display screen for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-3 and 5-7 depend upon allowable claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-3 and 5-7 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 8 teaches a processor that couples power to a light source to illuminate a display screen, determines at least one illumination time parameter corresponding to a message displayed on the display screen, wherein the at least one illumination time parameter is based on at least one of a length of the message, a number of lines of the display screen required to display the message, and a type of message to be displayed, and

maintains a coupling of power to the light source for a period of time that is based on the at least one illumination time parameter. As noted above, such a processor is not taught by Brenner. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 8 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 9-10 and 12-15 depend upon allowable claim 8, the applicants respectfully request that claims 9-10 and 12-15 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 19 was objected to by the Examiner as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form to incorporate many of the limitations of the corresponding base claim. The applicants contend that claim 19, as amended, is not taught by Brenner. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 19 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claim 20 depends upon allowable claim 19, the applicants respectfully request that claim 20 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Tal Mor, et al.

By: 

Steven A. May
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,912
Phone No.: 847/576-3635
Fax No.: 847/576-3750